

Application No. 10/590926
Response to the Office Action dated April 4, 2008

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks.

The disclosure has been objected to because of the informalities. Claims 3 and 6 have been objected to because of the informalities.

The paragraph appearing at page 7, lines 14-19 and claims 3 and 6 were amended together with other portions of the specification and claims 1 and 4 under Article 34 of the Patent Cooperation Treaty at the international stage. A translation of the amendments was filed with the present national stage request on August 28, 2006. Accordingly, the amendments to the specification and the claims should have been considered, and this objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,523,154) in view of Girgis (U.S. Patent No. 4,476,191). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully note that the Okamura reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,468,654) listed in the notice of references cited is divisional of the '154 Okamura reference (hereinafter referred to as "Okamura"). Okamura discloses a composition of a coating agent that includes highly saturated polymer rubber latex (A), rubber latex (B) that is not a highly saturated polymer rubber, and a water-soluble resorcinol/formaldehyde condensate (see coln. 2, lines 10-16). However, Okamura fails to disclose that the coating agent also includes novolac-type phenol resin that is obtained through reaction between phenol and formaldehyde in presence of an acid catalyst and that the water-soluble resorcinol/formaldehyde condensate is a novolac-type condensation product as claim 1 requires.

Girgis fails to disclose use of both novolac-type phenol resin and novolac-type water-soluble condensation product in the composition. Instead, the reference discloses use of a small amount of phenol in a mixture with resorcinol to react with aldehyde for

Application No. 10/590926

Response to the Office Action dated April 4, 2008

phenolic aldehyde resin (see coln. 6, lines 3-12). The reference further discloses that phenolic aldehyde resin including phenol may be manufactured using two steps; in the first step, the phenolic compound mixture and the aldehyde are reacted in an acidic pH 3.5-5.5, and in the second step, the first step reactants are treated at a range of pH 7-7.5 (see coln. 4, lines 45-52). In contrast, claim 1 requires that the phenol resin included in the composition be obtained through reaction between phenol and formaldehyde in presence of an acid catalyst in the composition. Accordingly, the phenol resin of claim 1 is distinguished from Girgis.

In addition, Girgis does not specifically disclose that phenolic aldehyde resin other than the resin including phenol of the reference is a novolac-type water-soluble condensation product. A novolac-type condensation product is generally known as a product obtained in an acidic condition. The reference discloses that the phenolic aldehyde resin such as a resorcinol formaldehyde condensate may be manufactured using two steps as discussed above for the phenolic aldehyde resin (see coln. 6, lines 49-59, coln. 7, lines 17-28, examples I-III at colns. 11-12). The reinforcing cords that use resole-type condensation product (comparative example 5), which is prepared under influence of an alkaline catalyst, show a low strength retention rate against bending at a high temperature, while the reinforcing cords using the novolac-type condensation product show high durability against bending and high dimensional stability at both room and high temperatures (examples 1-6) (see tables 4 and 6 at page 13 and 15, respectively, and page 15, lines 10-15 of the specification). Accordingly, the novolac-type water-soluble condensation product of claim 1 would be different from the phenolic aldehyde resin and the resorcinol formaldehyde condensate product of Girgis. Also, there is no reasonable basis to remove an intermediate phenolic aldehyde resin that has completed only the first step of the reaction from Girgis and insert it into Okamura.

According to the above, claim 1 is distinguished from Okamura in view of Girgis.

Claims 4 and 10 are distinguished from Okamura in view of Girgis for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 1. Accordingly, claims 1, 4, and 10 are distinguished from Okamura in view of Girgis, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/590926
Response to the Office Action dated April 4, 2008

In view of the above, Applicants request reconsideration of the application in the form of a Notice of Allowance.



Dated: October 6, 2008

DPM/ad

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: 

Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300